

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 and 23-48 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 25, 33, 47 and 48 have been amended and claims 49-53 have been added by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1, 25, 33, 47 and 48 and new claims 49-53 do not introduce any new subject matter.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**Rejection Of Claims 1-8, 13-20 And 23-24**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-8, 13-20 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,794,164 ("Beckert") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,663,155 ("Malone").

Applicants respectfully submit that Beckert and Malone, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a connector integrated into a member for physically mounting a display on an assembly housing, wherein removal of the member from the assembly housing electrically disconnects the display from a bus, as recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner admits that Beckert does not disclose the member as recited in claim 1 for physically mounting the display on the assembly housing and cites to Malone to cure this deficiency. Malone, however, does not disclose a member and integrated connector, wherein upon removal of the member from the assembly housing, the electrical connection between the display and the bus is broken. In contrast, Malone discloses a configuration where the electrical connection remains in tact when the display is removed from a housing. See Figs. 15-16 of Malone. Accordingly, Malone teaches away from the configuration recited in amended claim 1, and cannot be

combined with Beckert to render the configuration obvious.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Beckert in view of Malone. In addition, for at least the reason that claims 2-8, 13-20 and 23-24 depend from claim 1, claims 2-8, 13-20 and 23-24 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-8, 13-20 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and submit that claims 1-8, 13-20 and 23-24 are in condition for allowance.

Rejection Of Claims 9-12 And 47-48

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 9-12 and 47-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckert in view of Malone as in claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,339,696 ("Chan"). Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 as amended is patentable over the cited references and that for at least the reason that claims 9-12 depend from claim 1, claims 9-12 are also patentable over the cited references. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 47 and 48 are patentable over the cited references.

*Claim 1 And The Claims Dependent Thereon
Are Patentable Over The Cited References*

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the connector integrated into a member for physically mounting the display on an assembly housing, wherein upon removal of the member from the assembly housing, the display is electrically disconnecting from the bus, as recited in amended claim 1.

As stated above, Beckert fails to teach or suggest the limitations recited in claim

1 and Malone teaches away from breaking the electrical connection between the display and the bus when the member is removed from the housing. Furthermore, Chan contains no teaching regarding the integration of a connector into a member for mounting the display on an assembly housing.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the connector and member configuration, as defined in newly amended claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to modify Beckert, in view of Malone and further in view of Chan, to develop the configuration as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment of the invention, as defined in amended claim 1, is patentable over Beckert, in view of Malone and claim 1 and further in view of Chan. For at least the reason that claims 9-12 depend from claim 1, claims 9-12 are also submitted to be patentably distinct over the cited references. As such, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and submit that claims 47 and 48 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 47 and 48 Are Patentable Over The Cited References

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest first and second transmitters wirelessly transmitting first and second video signals on respective first and second frequencies, wherein wireless receivers of first and second displays are respectively tuned to the first and second frequencies for respectively receiving the first and second video signals, as recited in amended claim 47.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, when taken

alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest two wireless transmitters operatively coupled to two media sources for wirelessly transmitting first and second video signals corresponding to first and second video programs to two displays, wherein each of the two displays comprises a wireless receiver for wirelessly receiving the first and second video signals, and the first and second video signals are encoded for preventing interference between the two displays, which respectively and simultaneously display first and second video programs, as recited in amended claim 48.

As admitted by the Examiner, Beckert fails to address a wireless transmitter coupled to a media source. July 9, 2004 Office Action at 8. Chan does not have any disclosure regarding wireless transmission of video signals, disclosing only transmission of an audio signal to a wireless radio frequency receiver, and a physical connection between the video player and display for transmission of video signals to a display. See col. 5, lines 13-32 and Fig. 1. Furthermore, neither Beckert, Chan nor Malone disclose the use of multiple transmitters connected to multiple video sources for wirelessly transmitting multiple video signals to multiple displays. Also, none of the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, disclose the use of different frequencies or encoding of the video signals to prevent interference between multiple video signals simultaneously transmitted to multiple displays in the vehicle.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 47 and 48, as amended, are patentable over Beckert in view of Malone as in claim 1 and further in view of Chan.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 47 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and submit that claims 47 and 48 are in condition for allowance.

Rejection Of Claims 25-46

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 25-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckert in view of Malone and U.S. Patent No. 6,283,299 ("Lee").

Applicants respectfully submit that Beckert, when taken alone or in combination with Malone and Lee, fails to teach or suggest an electrical connector in a member for mounting a display on an assembly housing such that removal of the member from the housing results in an electrical disconnection of the display from the bus, as recited in amended claims 25 and 33.

As stated above, Beckert fails to teach or suggest the member for mounting a display on an assembly housing and Malone teaches away from breaking the electrical connection between the display and the bus when the member is removed from the housing. Furthermore, Lee also teaches away from the configuration recited in claims 25 and 33. Lee teaches the use of Velcro to physically hold the display in place and wires to electrically connect the display to the media player. See Lee, Figs. 2 and 4. Lee contains no teaching regarding the integration of a connector into a member for mounting the display on an assembly housing and teaches away from breaking the electrical connection between the display and bus when the member is removed, since the display in Lee is capable of being removed from the assembly housing without breaking the electrical connection created by the wires. Accordingly, Malone and Lee cannot be combined with Beckert to render the claimed configurations obvious.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the invention as defined in amended claims 25 and 33 are patentable over Beckert, in view of Malone and Lee. For at least the reason that claims 26-32 and 46 depend from claim 25 and

claims 34-45 depend from claim 33, claims 26-32 and 34-46 are also submitted to be patentably distinct over the cited references.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, disclose wireless transmission of multiple video signals to multiple displays, as recited in claim 44.

As such, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 25-46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

NEW CLAIMS

Applicants respectfully submit new claims 49-53 for consideration and that new claims 49-53 are patentable over the cited references.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, it is suggested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888